



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,870	07/15/2003	Jean-Marie Mathias	F-5235 CON 2	7779
7590 10/04/2004			EXAMINER	
BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORPORATION			BIANCO, PATRICIA	
Bradford R.L. Price, Fenwal Division-RLP-30			ART UNIT	
Route 120 and Wilson Road			PAPER NUMBER	
Round Lake, IL 60073			3762	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,870	Mathias et al.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia M Bianco	3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/15/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: Detailed Action.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the arrows on figures 3b, 3C, 4B, 4C, 4D & 4E indicating the direction of plasma or cellular components movement through the system are not clearly indicated. Thicker arrows would be more distinct and therefore clearer. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: No figure "36" appears on figure 3A as indicated on page 8, line 35- page 9, line 3. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant has indicated co-pending applications in the first paragraph of the specification. The first page of the specification should be updated to clarify the status of all related applications noted in the first paragraph of the specification. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has

become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a) Throughout the specification applicant refers to the Incremental Volume first as " V_i " and then " V_i ". Further, V_i " is then disclosed as the volume of residual air within the air tube. This inconsistency is confusing as to the general description as well as interpretation of the equation on page 5, 11 which incorporates the limitation.

b) Transfer tubing is first disclosed as "54" on page 8 and then as "transfer tubing 36" with reference to figure 3A on page 8, line 17-page 9, line 3. No "36" appears on the figure and there is a discrepancy in the specification as to whether these transfer tubing are the same or different.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balteau et al. (4,790,815). Balteau et al. (hereafter Balteau) teaches of a blood treatment system (12) comprising a container (10/14), transfer tubing (18/26), an integral tube (11) at one end wherein there is an air pocket or reservoir surrounding the tube at the seal area and therefore inherently coupled in-line with the tubing. The air reservoir is in communication with the transfer tubing and the tubing extends into the reservoir a given distance. (See figures 1 & 2; col. 2, line 61-col. 4, line 41)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

Art Unit: 3762

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balteau ('815) in view of Page et al. (5,601,730). Balteau discloses the claimed invention substantially, however, does not teach that the system has an in-line filter in the tubing between the reservoir and the container.

Page et al. (hereafter Page) teaches of a system for processing blood products comprising a first container (10), tubing (11) and a filter (12) in-line with the transfer tubing. (See figures 1-4, col. 3, line 21-col. 4, line 27)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Balteau by including a filter as taught by Page between the reservoir and the container to allow the operator to ensure that no extraneous cellular material is passed to the container through the transfer tubing when storing plasma.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 20 & 21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3 & 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,745. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are merely a broader recitation of the patent claims. The application claims are directed to a heat sterilized blood processing system comprising a container, flexible transfer tubing extending from and establishing flow communication with the container, an air reservoir in-line with the tubing, an air tube in the transfer tubing extending a certain distance into the air reservoir and further including an in-line filter in the transfer tubing between the air reservoir and the container. The difference between the application claims and the patent claims is that the container is referred to as "*a transfer container*," the transfer tubing is not explicitly recited as being *flexible* and the system is not recited to be *heat sterilized*. However, a broad interpretation of the patent "*transfer container*" inherently includes the broader recitation of "a container" as recited in the application. With respect to the transfer tubing, it is obvious that transfer tubing for medical applications, especially within the blood processing art, is well known to be *flexible* therefore this is an obvious modification in the application. Also, the limitation in the application claims that the blood processing system is *heat sterilized* would be obvious since it is well known in the art, especially within the

Art Unit: 3762

blood processing art, that all materials that are part of a system will be sterilized for health safety precautions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia M Bianco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1482. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00-6:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 28th, 2004

Patricia M Bianco
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3762


PATRICIA BIANCO
PRIMARY EXAMINER